1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

435 burdened down with gold, drowned ignominiously in the canals. Diaz, however, noted Indian usage and confined himself to four jades which he was able to exchange later and which, in his words, "served me well in healing my wounds and gathering me food."[10]

648 181 The Aztecs did not have our modern esteem for gold, so the Spaniards had great difficulty in getting it at first. The Mexican Indians responded to the invaders' demands for objects of value by offering jade and turquoise, those substances most precious to themselves. Such misguided compliance was highly irritating to Cortes and his men, who had no ethnological training; nor, it is only fair to say, would they have wanted such education, were it available. Gold [325] was valuable to the Aztecs only for the ornaments which could be made from it, and silver may have had an even greater value, since nodules were rare and the Indians had no technique for smelting the ore.[11] (See Plates 46–47.)

262 24 Thus the Aztecs did not hold our ideas of value and wealth. Yet they contributed much to our prosperity and [567 well-being, partly through being forced as slaves to work 466] the gold and silver mines, whose modern economic significance they so little understood, and even more through the enrichment of the world's supply of foods. In addition to corn of several varieties, the Aztecs developed many sorts of beans, a very nutritive addition to human diet because of the high protein content. Squash, gourds, *chia*, *camotes*, green and red peppers, alligator pears and tomatoes were products of the versatile Middle American farmer, enriching the Aztec diet and that of the modern world. Trade with [135] southern Vera Cruz brought chocolate, vanilla and pineapples to the Aztec larder.[12]

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

Tlapan in the mid-sixteenth century gave 62 pesos, 3 tomines of gold quarterly, 3 loads of honey, 5 pots, and 3 loads of wax in pellets.[71] Tototepec, likewise about a generation after the Conquest, gave 50 measures of gold dust and certain articles of clothing quarterly, and daily gave the services of seven Indians, and a chicken to the Calpixque.[72] [A civil functionary in whose care the public stores were entrusted x - Analyst]

34. Tlachquiauco

Sources of the Map

The province of Tlachquiauco was not large. It contained three principal towns, according to folio 45r of the *Mendocino Codex*, the folio copied from the recto side of a lost leaf (page "22A") which followed Coyolapan and preceded Xoconochco in the original manuscript. Of the three towns of Tlachquiauco Province, one has not been located, but the other two (lying in northwestern Oaxaca) have been identified as follows on the "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheet "Ciudad de México":

Mendocino	Millionth Map
Achiotlan, 4	S. Miguel Achiutla
Tlachquiauco, 3	Tlaxiaco

The town which has eluded identification is Çapotlan.

Mixtepec (2) and Tlacotepec (1) are added from other sources.

Remarks on Towns

Mixtepec was subject to Tlachquiauco in the days when the latter still held out against the Mexica, and presumably fell with it.[73]

Tlacotepec appears in some of the younger Moctezuma's conquests jointly with Ycpatepec (in the province of Yoaltepec).

Tlachquiauco is a name which has suffered considerable corruption, but there is no novelty in the identification of the town.

Çapotlan appears vaguely linked with Etla and Macuilxochic in one source.[74]

---

[71] *PNE*, 1: No. 725: "dan cada ochenta dias sesenta y dos pesos y tres tomines de oro en polùo y tres cargas de miel y çinco xarros y tres cargas de çera en pellas." The statement also includes similar data from near-by towns.

[72] *PNE*, 1: No. 28: "dan cada ochenta dias çinquenta pesos de oro en poluo y çinco naguas y ocho mantillas, y cinco mantas grandes; mas dan siete yndias de seruicio cada dia y una gallina al Calpixque."

[73] *PNE*, 4: 142: "el caçique de tlaxiaco que era a quien estos de mistepeque reconocian por señor tenia guerra con montecuma."

[74] *ENE*, 16: 68.

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

622
618
423

child),[99] and those who cultivated them carried the appellation of "tlalmaitl"—hands of the soil.[100]

The "tlalmilpa," whether held by chiefs or by ordinary members 423
of the kin ("macehuales") were, therefore, the only tracts of land possessed for use by individuals in ancient Mexico. They were so far distinguished from the "tecpantlalli" and "tlatocatlalli" in their mode of tenure as, whereas the latter two were dependent

[99] It is just the "pillali" which oppose the greatest difficulties to this investigation, and to a clear conception of the mode of tenure of lands in ancient Mexico. They are generally represented (whenever mentioned), as private domains of the chiefs. Torquemada (Lib. XIV, pp. 345 and 346), distinguishes two kinds of "pillali." The first one he says might be sold.—but he places the restriction upon them, that such as held lands through conquest ("sujecion") or through gift ("merced") of the chief, had to go to the descendants, as majorat; and if they died without heirs, the King, or Lord [428]
became such, and they were incorporated into his royal Estates." The other kind was not transmissible at all. Clavigero (Lib. XVII, cap. XIV). We notice here a confusion between official tracts and such lots of the "calpulli" as pertained to the chief's family in consequence of their membership of the Kin. Also between "tribute-lots" and the official tracts, of conquered tribes. Torquemada acknowledges, that the "pillali," upon the death of the family, were incorporated in the calpulli to which that family belonged, "in order that they might pay tribute." This ought to define their true position and nature.

[100] From "tlalli" soil, and "maitl" hand. Hands of the soil. Molina (Parte IIa, p. 427
124), has: "tlalmaitl"—"labrador, ò gañan." This name is given in distinction of the "macehuales" or people working the soil in general. The tlalmaites are identical with the "mayeques." See Zurita (p. 224), "tlalmaites or mayeques, which signifies tillers of the soil of others . . . ." He distinguishes them plainly from the "tecalleс" [564]
which are the "tecpanpouhque" or "tecpantlaca" formerly mentioned as attending to a class of official lands (p. 221, Zurita). Herrera (Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XVII, p. 138). "These mayeques could not go from one tract to another, neither leave those which they cultivated, and they paid a rent to its masters according as they agreed upon ("en lo que se concertaban") in what they raised. They paid tribute to nobody else but the master of the land." This tends to show that there existed, not an established obligation, a serfdom, but a voluntary contract, that the "tlalmaites" were not serfs, but simply renters. Torquemada (Lib. XIV, cap. VII, p. 345), ". . . . those that were knights ("caballeros") and descendants of the families of the Kings, and Lords, had their particular lands and their rentals, where many of them held renters ("terrazgueros") which served them, tilled the crops and served them in their houses. These lands were called pillali or "land of nobles and knights." We prefer the etymology "piltontli" "niño ò niña, muchacho ó muchacha" (Molina, II, p. 82), or "piltzintli" niño ó niña" therefore lands of the children,—to the derivation from "pilli." The title of chief was "tecuhtli," and the word "pilli" substituted for it is certainly but in connection with the occupation of a particular place of office, and not a title itself. Bustamante ("Tezcoco, etc.," p. 330. "The sovereigns as well as the inferior Lords and other principals had their own patrimonial estates, and in them their mayeques or Tlalmayes, what these gave of rent were tributes of the Lord," Id. pp. 233 and 234).

The "tlalmaites" appear to have been free from other tributes, and free from com- [446]
munal labor outside of the "pillali" (Bustamante, p. 233. Herrera, Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XVII, p. 138). It is not very clear, however, whether this applies simply to the conquering tribe alone, or also to the tlalmaites of conquered tribes, as towards the tribute due by that tribe to their conquerors. The detailed relations between the two are yet somewhat obscure and confuse in some points.